



**Syddansk Universitet**

## **Membership categorization in international business phonecalls**

Rasmussen, Gitte

*Published in:*  
Journal of Pragmatics

*Publication date:*  
2008

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for pulished version (APA):*

Hougaard, G. R. (2008). Membership categorization in international business phonecalls: The importance of 'being international'. Journal of Pragmatics, 40, 307-332.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Membership categorization in international business phonecalls

## The importance of ‘being international’

Gitte Rasmussen Hougaard

*Center for Social Practices and Cognition, Institute of Language and Communication,  
Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark*

Received 21 June 2007; received in revised form 7 August 2007; accepted 31 August 2007

---

### Abstract

Companies consider themselves ‘international’ when they operate in an international context. Many studies have analyzed communication in international contexts; few, however, have done so with a focus on how conversationalists in the international world of business orient themselves towards that context. This paper analyzes interactions between company representatives of different nationalities. It focuses on how businesspeople interact in an international context and categorize one another as members of different nations. The article also intends to show how the conversational partners categorize themselves as members of the international business world and ascribe importance to that membership in and through their coordinated actions in what the present author calls *doing being ‘international’*. One of the features of this phenomenon is an explicit statement to the effect that the companies represented by the speakers do business with *several* different countries. Another feature is that the identification by co-conversationalists of these business partners in different countries is *not* intended.

© 2007 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Membership categorization; International; Business; Phonecalls

---

### 1. Introduction

Companies consider themselves to be ‘international’ when they operate in an international market. The present article analyzes interactions between company representatives of different nationalities; it intends to show how the conversational partners interactively construct their membership of the international business world and thereby express the international character of

---

*E-mail address:* [gitter@language.sdu.dk](mailto:gitter@language.sdu.dk).

their interaction. The study contributes to the debate within the field of ethnomethodological and conversation analytic studies of how, when and why social categories are introduced, (re)established and thus oriented to in interaction. Since Harvey Sacks established this field of research (1967, 1972a, 1972b, 1979), the body of literature on membership categorization in interaction has grown considerably (Antaki and Widdicombe, 1998; Baker, 1997; Eglin and Hester, 1992, 1999; Housley and Fitzgerald, 2002; Wooffitt, 1992; Schegloff, 2007) and now includes the practice of making relevant categories such as gender (Eglin, 2002), culture (Baker, 2000; Hester and Eglin, 1997) and national identity (Hester and Housley, 2002). This article is a contribution to the last of these categories. It deals with the relevance of national categories in interaction, and more precisely, in business communication. In contrast to most of the articles mentioned above, it focuses not only on categorizational aspects but also analyses the sequential features of social interactions. It intends to show how representatives of different national companies categorize each other as members in and through the use of references to names of countries in identification sequences in the openings of telephone calls. In addition, it aims to show how the initial national identification sequences may be used as resources by the participants to present the companies as ‘international’ companies (section 3). This is achieved by the interactive construction of a phenomenon which I call *doing being ‘international’*: Speakers behave “internationally” when they refer to their companies’ numerous international contacts. Presumably, this phenomenon is not limited to interactions between partners from different countries. However, in this article I wish to highlight the importance which conversational partners in international interactions attribute to the fact that they operate on the international market (in general as well as in the concrete local interaction), i.e. the importance of being members of the international business world.

The database used for the present analysis consists of a set of 20 conversations taken from a larger corpus. All of the 20 conversations have the following features in common: (1) they are conducted in German in the institutional framework of a Danish company, and (2) they take place on the telephone, and (3) they are natural in the sense that they are not produced for the purpose of the present research, but for business reasons. The participants in these interactions are sellers and buyers of various goods as, for example, fodder additives. Thus, with the exception of one speaker, who is the son of a farmer, the conversational partners are all company representatives, and they are citizens of the following countries: Belgium, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, and the Czech Republic.<sup>1</sup> The participants all had prior contact with each other, some having previously talked to each other on the phone several times, while others had communicated with each other in writing. The names of companies and persons are anonymized in the transcripts.

The conversations have been transcribed in detail in accordance with the transcription system first developed by Gail Jefferson. (See Appendix A for a list of the transcription conventions.) This system is employed primarily in Conversation Analysis, the methodological framework of the present article.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Though English is used as a second/foreign language in interactions between people from the countries mentioned, it is not unusual to use German. In some of these calls the language of communication has been decided in previous calls, whereas in others it is negotiated for the first time in the opening of the call analysed in this article (see also Rasmussen and Wagner, 2002).

<sup>2</sup> For detailed introductions to CA, see Bergmann (1994), Goodwin and Heritage (1990), Heritage (1984, 1987), Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), Nofsingert (1991), Psathas (1995), Steensig (2001), and ten Have (1999).

## 2. Mentioning countries in opening sequences in international business phone calls

In the phone calls analyzed for this study the company representatives make it relevant to the interaction at some point that their companies do business across national borders. In all calls national categories, i.e. names of countries are made relevant for the first time in the opening slots of the call as shown in extract 1a.

- Ex. (1a)<sup>3</sup> (A represents a German, B a Danish company)
- (1) A: geige-  
geige  
(2) (0.8)
- (3) B: 'ja: gu:dn tag herr geige ↓hi:er ist he' herr grim  
yes hello mr. geige here is mr grim
- (4) aus' dänema:rk;  
from denmark  
(5) (0.7)
- (6) A: wer is dah\*,  
who is there  
(7) (0.6)
- (8) B: eh: hh\*err grim: aus (0.5) firma' 'wiwoda:n  
ahm mr. grim from wiwodan company
- (9) d:änemark;  
denmark  
(10) (0.6)
- (11) A: ah\*ah\*  
ahah

In the opening of a phone call such as extract (1a) identification and recognition are highly relevant. B not only introduces himself with his last name but adds the place reference “aus' dänema:rk” (from denmark), thus identifying the country from which the call is made. The stress on the name of the country is in the medium range (dänema:rk), and since all the other accented syllables have weak stress, it is heard as emphasized. In line (8), he adds the name of the company he represents, and thus treats the repair initiated by A in line (6) as an indication of the fact that his partner did not recognize him. As Schegloff (1979) has shown for American telephone conversations, the way speaker B establishes his identity indicates that he expects to be recognized, although he provides as little information as possible. He does not give the entire possible sequence of first name, last name, the name of the company, and its address, consisting of street name, street number, city, region, and country.<sup>4</sup> Only after his initial effort has failed in lines (3)/(4), does he provide additional information (the name of his firm). Interestingly, the place reference “Denmark”, with its medium stress, remains unchanged; clearly, the speaker puts significant weight on the name of country, since he underscores it by the use of stress.

In this position (in line (9)), however, mentioning the name of the country seems to do something else in addition to merely identifying the place from which the caller is making the call (as in lines (3)/(4)). Building on the information already given in line (4), the caller (B) identifies

<sup>3</sup> Extracts from the same conversation are labeled a, b and c to indicate the order in which they occur in the interaction.

<sup>4</sup> Previous to this call, speaker B has sent some written sales materials to speaker A and he may build on this in identifying himself in the opening of this call, which is the first spoken communication between them.

himself with respect to the company he represents (*mr. grim from wiwodan company*) and identifies the company with respect to the country in which it is situated (*mr. grim from wiwodan company denmark*). On hearing these identification items (name of the company and the country in which it is situated) the person called (A) shows that he recognizes his partner by a minimal response which may be described as a kind of low-voiced acknowledgement of what has just been said. Thus in introductory positions like lines (8) and (9) (extract 1a), the conversational partners establish a link between the country from which the call is made and the location of the firm, thus indicating that the country in which the caller's firm is situated is relevant to them.

While the caller adds the name of the company, a more precise description of the place in Denmark where the firm is located and from where the phone call is made, such as, “wiwodan slagelse (a town in Denmark) dänemark”, is not given. The town remains unmentioned. Instead, the name of the country is highlighted: it appears to be of prime importance in this context. How can this be explained? Obviously, in order to establish the relevance of a certain place name, the speaker has to determine his own location, and that of his or her conversational partner, as well as (as in example (2b) below) that of the object whose location is to be identified.

Ex. (2b) (A represents an Italian, B a Danish company)

- (1) A: [\*h\*h ] un dann: ha:ben wir: mit eh >zu tun mit<=  
and then we are dealing with ahm
- (2) B: [°(also)°]
- (3) A: = fir:ma ↑pra:l aus deu:tschland; >mit de firma:  
the pral company from germany with the firm
- (4) ↓halpogro: \*h eh kukulei in ↓fi:nnlande'.=mit eh (.) \*h  
halpogro h ahm kukulei in finland with ahm
- (5) eh blu:menflor ↑auch in deutschland  
ahm flower express also in germany
- (6) B: ahh\*a:  
ahha

The local identification of companies is done via the respective countries in which they are located. This localization is relevant, since the conversational partners are in places (i.e. countries) different from those in which the companies they mention are located. In addition, it may be of importance that the conversational partners are not in the same place either: A is in Italy, while B is in Denmark. Consequently with respect to localization, A cannot build on a common point of reference with B,<sup>5</sup> nor can he presuppose the existence of a ‘common sense geography’ (Schegloff, 1972) that is valid for both Germany and Finland.<sup>6</sup> Local place names in the respective countries are thus not easily *recognizable*, for one's conversational partner:

<sup>5</sup> For instance, as Schegloff (1972) points out, when explaining to someone on the street how to get to a certain place, one normally uses deictic expressions that have reference to the common *origo* of both, the person asking and the one giving directions: *When you get to the church over there take a right.*

<sup>6</sup> A ‘common sense geography’ for Germany would imply that one could assume that one's conversational partner is able to mentally map the location of the different *Länder* (federal states) and possibly their major cities. Similarly, in the case of a particular *Land*, e.g. Baden-Württemberg, a ‘common sense geography’ presupposes a knowledge of its major cities and towns, whereas the localization of a district like Saulgau presupposes a ‘common sense geography’ for Oberschwaben. In turn, being able to place a village like Altshausen would presuppose a ‘common sense geography’ of the Saulgau region. Schegloff (1972) has established the existence of a similar hierarchy for American data: “These materials would seem to display elements of a common sense geography. They seem to display also a kind of hierarchic or concentric organization of units, . . .” (p. 86).

“What I mean by ‘recognizability’ is that the hearer can perform operations on the name — categorize it, find out which class it is being used as a member of, bring knowledge to bear on it, detect which of its attributes are relevant in context, etc.” (Schegloff, 1972:91)

In contrast, A (in extract (2b)) builds on a ‘common sense geography’ presumably common to the conversational partners as Europeans. Similarly, speaker B in (1a) above presupposes that he and his interlocutor possess a ‘common sense geography’ of Europe (*d:änemark*).

Common to both conversations (Extracts (1a) and (2b)) is the fact that the respective speakers give a place reference, in the form of the country or countries, respectively and that, in addition to this, the speaker provides other means for identification (e.g. names of firms) — all of which is expected to contribute to the conversational partner's identification of a certain object. Sections 3 and 4 below will show how the making relevant of national ‘identity’ (here the country in which a company is located) in the opening sequence is used as a resource in subsequent sequences of the call.

### 2.1. Membership analysis and common sense geography

When a speaker decides to describe a certain location, he not only carries out a place analysis, but at the same time performs an analysis of the category that the *conversational partner* belongs to.<sup>7</sup> The two analyses are interrelated; thus, a “common sense geography” of Europe builds on an analysis according to which the conversational partner belongs to the category ‘European’. Of course, conversational partners belong to many different categories. For the partners in the data used for the present article, this could be any of the following: men; fathers; husbands; salesmen; buyers; native speakers of Italian, German, or Danish; non-native speakers of German; Europeans; northern as opposed to Southern Europeans; Italians, Germans, Danes; caller and called etc. The category selected by the speaker must of course be relevant for the local identification of an object, if the conversational partner is to be able to recognize (i.e. analyze) the place that is mentioned. Extract (2) below shows (as did extract 1a above) that the conversational partner himself has an influence on which category he will be assigned to. The conversational partner contributes to the speaker's membership analysis in the opening of the phone call:

Ex. (2) (A represents an Italian, B a Danish company)

- (1) A: (X)  
(X)  
→ (2) B: eh (0.3) 'ove grimm aus' firma' wiwoda:n in d̥ä:nemark̥  
ahm ove grimm from wiwodan company in denmark  
(3) (0.4)  
(4) A: \*h j̥:ḁ guden tag̥  
yes, hello

<sup>7</sup> For a detailed analysis of *membership categories*, cf. Sacks (1972a). See also Coulter (1982), Eglin and Hester (1992), Jayyusi (1984), McHoul and Watson (1984) who suggest that ‘collectivities’ and non-personal objects can be seen in ways that are similar to those of Sacks’ personal membership categories.

In his first verbal turn, B identifies himself by his full name, company, and country. In doing so, he stresses the company's national identity, so that the latter is understood as an important category.<sup>8</sup>

When the speaker (A, an Italian, in extracts 2 and 2a) has allocated a category to his conversational partner, this affects the way he describes the location of an object by using a country name, as can be clearly seen in example (2a) below. Here, the speaker interrupts what seems to be a sequence of countries in order to locate the object “substrate” ((1) *substr:a:te:*) more precisely in Denmark. He does this by giving the name of a company working with the object:

Ex. (2a) (A represents an Italian, B a Danish company)

- (1) A: \*h dann: eh *substr:a:te:* au:f: eh *h:ollan*, *däne*<*ma:rke:*>  
then ahm substrates for hollan[d] denmark
- (2) (0.5) \*h 'in *dänema:r:ke* ar:beiten:: <*w:i:r:* eh mit  
in denmark we work ahm with the firm
- (3) der: *f:irma:* > \*h eh *ga:bo* die: eine:: *firma* bei euch,  
of ahm gabo that has a company with you people
- (4) *h:h\*a:t.=* in *dänema:r:ke* \*h <*das:* eh iste die:> firma  
in denmark, that is the firm of
- (5) stig rainer  
stig rainer
- (6) (0.8)
- (7) A: °wie sie *kennen*°. [*\*h\*h\*h\*h* ]  
as you know
- (8) B: [wi wie *heisst*] es?  
what is it called

In (2a), A explicitly expresses his assumption that B is familiar with the firm called “stig rainer.”. However, as indicated by the micropause in line (6) and the initiation of a repair in line (8), speaker B does not know it. The fact that the firm “stig rainer.” is mentioned suggests that the Italian places his interlocutor in the following categories: He represents a company situated in Denmark, and he belongs to the same branch of business as A himself. This is what the partners orient to in the subsequent discourse:

Ex. (2a, 2b) (A represents an Italian, B a Danish company)

- (7) A: °wie sie *kennen*°. [*\*h\*h\*h\*h* ]  
as you know
- (8) B: [wi wie *heisst*] es?  
what is it called

<sup>8</sup> Incidentally, this co-participant (A) later in the telephone conversation (extract (2c)), orients towards the national category as he constructs the people living in Denmark as a group (creating a *wir* ‘we’ versus *euch* ‘you people’ dichotomy): Ex. (2c) (In this extract the called, A, talks about farming in Italy)

- (1) A: de denn: eh *n:ichte* in *italien* ist es' *n:icht'* so: (.)  
be because ahm not in italy it is not like that
- (2) \*h h\* eh *wie:* bei *eu:ch* wo: <°man: das:°> *gu:t* machen  
ahm as with you people where one can do that
- (3) *kannz=* weil die *tier:e* immer in:: (.) eh immer *drau:ßen* sind  
easily because the animals always in ahm always are outside

It should be noted that the speaker by mentioning ‘Italy’ exclusively refers to geography, rather than nationality, “in italy we can leave the cattle outdoors”, as he points to the relevance of the climate.

- (9) (0.3)
- (10) A: stig rainer.  
stig rainer
- (11) (1.3)
- (12) B: °stig rai:ner<sub>ζ</sub>°  
stig rainer
- (13) (0.6)
- (14) A: ja' in: eh dänemark. [\*h\*h ] un dann: ha:ben wir:=  
yes in ah denmark. and then we are ahm
- (15) B: [°(also)°]  
so
- (16) A: mit eh >zu tun mit< fir:ma ↑pra:l aus deu:tschland;  
dealing with ahm the firm of pral from germany
- (17) >mit de firma: ↓halpogro: \*h eh kukulei in  
with the firm halpogro kukulei in
- (18) ↓fi:nlände'.=mit eh (.) \*h eh blu:menflor ↑auch in'  
finland. with ahm ahm blumenflor also
- (19) deutschland,  
in germany
- (20) B: ahh\*a:  
aha
- (21) (.)
- (22) A: \*h u::nd eh >ist das: eh' s:ind das beka:nnte< ↑firmen  
and ahm is that ahm are those familiar firms for
- (23) für euch?  
you people
- (24) B: n::nein nicht eh a:lsa we i' i' eh' w'ir sind'  
no not ahm so we ahm we are
- (25) >'g:laub ich nicht in die:< (0.4) in die glei:che:  
I believe not in the (0.4) in the same
- (26) (0.5) eh  
(0.5) ahm
- (27) A: B:R[ANch. ]  
line
- (28) B: [bra:nch]  
line

Speaker A builds his utterances in lines (14)–(19) on shared knowledge that he, as a business partner of the companies mentioned above, assumes to have with speaker B, who is a Northern European and in the same line of business. This assumed shared knowledge allows him to focus on names of companies abroad (i.e., in countries other than Italy and Denmark), giving them medium stress (↑pra:l, ↓halpogro:, kukulei, blu:menflor), while the countries are only given weak emphasis. Speaker A's analysis of the line of business, however, does not hold, as speaker B says in as many words in lines (24)/(28) “we are I believe not in the (0.4) in the same (0.5) ahm line”). The preceding pauses and the turn onset in line (15) are possibly first indications of this. In examples (2a) and (2b), the conversational partners make the membership analysis explicitly relevant; this analysis thus turns out to be a shared and interactive undertaking. In lines (22)–(28)



(as well as (7) and (8)) the participants *analyze* in terms of their world knowledge, i.e. their knowledge about and therefore membership of a specific line of business. Moreover, in the *context* in which their analysis occurs, the participants also orient towards the membership knowledge that one is *assumed* to have when one represents company X from country Y (which was made relevant in the identification sequences): they use names of companies and countries as entities they can be expected to know. In this way they design their turns specifically to co-participants as European members of this line of business. In other words: they speak and treat each other as members of a specific group without saying ‘I/You say as a member’. This way of designing their turns on the basis of assumed shared knowledge is also significant to the way in which they present their respective companies.

### 3. Presenting international companies or doing ‘being international’

The presentation of companies in the data has amongst other features one that stands out: the mentioning of countries.

This is illustrated in the following extract, where A, the person called, representing an Italian company, introduces his company to his co-participant who represents a Danish company.

Ex. (3)

- (1) B: 'ich möchte auch gern ein bißchen me:hr von ihr fi:rma  
I would also like to know a little more about your
- (2) wi:ssen.=alsa: w' w'sie verkau:fen verschiedene dinge  
company like h h how you are selling different things
- (3) in: eh (0.4) ah 'chemische pro' produh\*k'te  
in ahm (0.4)) ahm chemical
- (4) [für die: °landwirde°]  
for the farmers
- (5) A: [\*h ah ja also wi: ]:r wi' che↑mica? (0.2) ist eine:  
ahm yes so we w chemica (0.2) is
- (6) für:ma die im: den vierzigern: 'nach dem krie:g ↓also  
a firm that in the forties after the war that is
- (7) eh in: eh zh\*weiund↓fünf↑zi:g, h geöffnet worden  
ahm in ahm fifty two was opened,
- (8) ↑iste, \*hh unde wir: ver:kaufen:: ver:treiben: ganz  
and we sell distribute through all of
- (9) italien durchh\*e ein:e >ganze netz< vone \*h  
italy via an entire network of
- (10) v:er:käu↑fer:ne, eh chemische:< dünge↑mi:ttel,  
salespeople, ahm chemical fertilizers,
- (11) (0.8)
- (12) B: ah düngemiddel ja:=  
oh fertilizers, yes,
- (13) A: =ja' düngemi:del dann eh \*h f:u:tter:zusatzmi:ttel?  
yes fertilizers then ahm fodder additives?
- (14) (0.2)
- (15) B: j:a=  
yes

- (16) A: =eh:: al:so: >ganz besondern< aus ö:sterr:eiche: >und  
ahm so very typically from austria and
- (17) ander:e ↑länder:<, [\*h\*h ]=  
other countries
- (18) B: [ahh\*a,]  
ahha
- (19) A: =uh\*nd dann: eh 'viel to:rf aus: eh ↑schwedene:? aus  
and then ahm much peat from sweden from
- (20) ↓r:uslan:de:ɿ aus deutschlan:de.  
russiaɿ from germany
- (21) \*h\*h au:s: ehh\* 'hh\*olland und' >andere re↑gio:[nen?<]  
from ahm holland and other regions
- (22) B: [m: ]

In lines (1)/(2) B invites A to tell him about the company he represents ('I would also like to know a little more about your company like h h how you are selling different things'). A initiates this presentation in lines (6) following ('ahm yes so we w chemica (0.2) is a firm that in the forties after the war that is'). This presentation develops sequentially into the phenomenon that I call *doing 'being international'*. As can be inferred from lines 18 through 21, the following features are characteristic of this phenomenon: (1) identification work by *mentioning* countries and (2) *listing* those countries.

### 3.1. Identification work

As could be seen in extracts (2a) and (2b), speaker A does not just mention the respective company names, but provides a number of features that the recipient can avail himself of when trying to identify the firm "stig rainer". Among these features are (examples (2a) and (2b), lines (1)–(5)): company names ("gabo, stig rainer"); names of countries ("denmark"); category terms ("a company", "substrates"). These contribute in a different way to the identification than the first two features: They provide information on the work that is carried out in the firm or location in question, in order to describe the place for the recipient in a meaningful way that allows him to analyze and identify it.

However, the speaker does not always mention a company name. As can be seen in extract (3) above (line (19): A: = and then ahm much peat from sweden?), there are other ways in which the business representatives identify a partner firm: they may mention the activities taking place in a country which are instrumental in defining the nature of the business. In this case, in contrast to examples (2a) and (2b), the speaker avails himself exclusively of the name of the country (the place of origin) of a product (peat). The partner firm that the speaker's company must deal with to get that product is not described at all. That is, the identification of the partner company is not relevant for the activity in progress.

Similarly, the speaker in extract (4) does not make it possible to identify his partner. In this extract, however, the speaker does *some* identification work:

Ex. (4)

- (1) B: in in in: eh 'in' (0.5) ehm ö:sterreich (.) hh\*abn wir  
in in in ahm (0.5) austria (.) we hh\*ave a (0.4)
- (2) eine: (0.4) eine kunde eine eine (0.4) v:ertreder,  
customer a a (0.4) representative

- (3) (0.4)  
 (4) A: j:a:  
       yes  
 (5) (0.6)  
 (6) B: 'die mit eh vorhe:r m:it eine: >produkt die heißt<  
       who with ahm earlier have worked with a product that is  
 (7) (0.3) seovita:l (.) gearbeitet habn.  
       called (0.3) seovital (.)

In this extract the speaker makes the country (Austria) in which his company does business relevant. Furthermore, he *describes* his business partner in Austria in *categorical* terms (eine v:ertreder/a representative). Sacks (1971) describes the use of category terms for *persons* as an important practice of non-recognitional reference:

That is to say, a Type 1 identification is one that the speaker produces with the intention of having the recipient use it to find some person that the recipient already knows. And a Type 2 identification is one that a speaker uses to indicate to the recipient that he should not employ it to attempt to find who, that he knows, is being referred to. In recipient terms, given Type 1 identification it's the recipient's business to try to find from it who, that he knows, is being referred to. And given Type 2, it's his business to recognize that he's not to try to find from it who he knows that is being referred to."

(Sacks, 1992 [1971]: 444–445)

From the data used to describe *doing 'being international'* it seems that the identification types for non-personal referents can be seen in similar ways to those of Sacks' personal identification types. This interactional phenomenon is characterized by the participants doing either no identification work (extract (3)) or a specific kind of *identification* work (extract (4)) of some company or business partner that does not make its exact *identification* possible.

Of course identification work depends on the thematic and sequential context. In example (3) (for a detailed analysis of example (4), see section 3.3), speaker A is engaged in introducing his own firm. At speaker B's suggestion, he presents his firm by referring to its activities and services. The latter (which are linked to "ö:sterr:eiche:") have to do with the fodder additives trade. Thus, when describing his own firm, the identification of his business partners is not made relevant; but the country in which they operate is.

### 3.2. Listing place names

Mentioning the name of a country does not necessarily imply that the speaker is *doing being 'international'*. The phenomenon is characterized by the fact that the speaker sets up a list of countries in which comparable or even identical activities are carried out.

Before going into an analysis of this feature, some brief preliminary considerations and analyses are in place with regard to what is achieved by listing place names (here countries). Listing lexical items has, of course, different functions, depending on the local context. The following extract, example (5) may illustrate this, although here it is activities rather than countries that are listed:

Ex. (5) (A represents a Belgian, B a Danish company)

- (1) B: >ich ich versteh' s:ie a:rbeite mit< m:it di:eh: mit  
I I understand you work with with the with
- (2) die hh\*obby,  
the hh\*obby
- (3) (0.6)
- (4) A: n:ein nicht allei:ne=wir sind' in' ↑hh\*obby:ber:eich,  
no not only we are in the hobby area in the
- (5) ↑im (↑ber:ufskettenr:ei)ber:ei:ch,  
(professional chain ar)area
- (6) ↓und stark auch in: eh (.) \*h °öffentliches° gr:ö:n  
and strong also in ahm (.) public green
- (7) und so weiter<sub>2</sub>=  
and so on
- (8) B: =ja  
yes

The conversational partners identify the company represented by speaker A. At this point, they do not describe the firm in terms of size (small, medium, large) or its organizational structure (corporation, share-holder company, private company, etc.) but by its activities. Speaker A expands the category of activities and services mentioned in line (2) (hh\*obby) to include two further areas (↑ber:ufskettenr:ei)ber:ei:ch,; °öffentliches° gr:ö:n). The speaker constructs this expansion by drawing up a list (Jefferson, 1990). He creates the impression of a list by giving the single elements medium stress, holding the pitch almost constant in the case of the first two elements, and using an identical intonation pattern for the stressed syllables (rising, medium). The intonation used for the first two elements indicates to the co-participant that a third one is to be expected, which in this case is produced differently, which may indicate that the sequence is coming to an end: this third element has weaker stress, the pitch is on a lower level, and the intonation is falling (medium). To this sequence, he adds 'and so on', to convey that in principle, he could expand the sequence further at this point. In this sequence, speaker A expands the category of activities his firm can offer. In this way, he states *how much* the company can produce, and in so doing, tells us something about the range of his company's products.

In the next example speaker A likewise expands the category that was made relevant initially. In (6), the category is that of geographical units, more precisely that of German federal states (*Länder*). In the stretch of conversation preceding the extract, his conversational partner, B, has tried to persuade A to test his product, a manure additive, that the salesman and producer B wants to launch on the German market:

Ex. (6) (A represents a German, B a Danish company)

- (1) A: >DEs ist leider< so: [>und des]halb sag ich, ich=  
unfortunately, that's the way it is and that's why I=
- (2) B: [ja' ]  
yes
- (3) A: =hab'< keine lust des da: irgendwelche' \*h\*h 'ze:hn  
say that I don't feel like somehow try and find any old \*h\* ten
- (4) oder fünf (0.2) oder oder ze:hn betr:iebe da irgendwo  
or five (0.2) or ten

- (5) auszusuchen,= ↓[den ein:] ↑in SÜ:ddeutschland den ein:=  
enterprises one in southern Germany one
- (6) B: [°nein° ]  
no
- (7) A: in würdemberg den ander:e in ↓hh\*essen:, \*h ↑>dann  
in württemberg the other in hesse, then again
- (8) habn wir denn< schle:swig hol'stein oder in  
we have schleswig-holstein or in
- (9) westfa:len oder sonst' irgendwo: [\*h\*h] (.) und da=  
westphalia or anywhere else and then
- (10) B: [ja']  
yes
- (11) A: =eigne versu:hh\*e zu machen um mir ne MEInung zu bildn<sub>i</sub>  
to try for myself to form an opinion
- (12) (.)
- (13) A: [\*h ↓d'a:] zu hab ich echt keine lüst.  
I simply don't feel like doing that
- (14) B: [°hm:° ]  
ahm

In line (5), speaker A introduces the category of geographical regions with “SÜ:ddeutschland” adding subsequently different subcategories of the principal category “germany”: “würdemberg”, “↓hh\*essen:”, “schle:swig hol'stein” and “westfa:len”. By means of a list (selecting federal states from the south and the north), the speaker emphasizes the size of the principal category “germany”; in doing this, he also indicates the amount of work and effort that he would have to put in if he were to proceed with trial marketing of the manure additive. He also indicates – as in example (5) – by his “sonst' irgendwo:” (“anywhere else”) in line 9 that the list exceeds the items listed in the sequence. In this context, the size of the country serves as an underpinning argument for the speaker's reluctance to go ahead with the trial marketing, as suggested by B.

When doing ‘being international’ the speaker lists geographical categories (federal states or countries). In doing this, he establishes a yardstick for the “national” category with which the importance of his own firm and its services can be measured. This is best seen in extract (3):

Ex. (3) (A represents an Italian, B a Danish company)

- (1) A: =eh:: al:so: >ganz besondern< aus ö:sterr:eiche: >und  
ahm that is, predominantly from austria and
- (2) ander:e ↑länder:<, [\*h\*h ]=  
other countries
- (3) B: [ahh\*a,]  
aha
- (4) A: =uh\*nd dann: eh 'viel to:rf aus: eh ↑schwedene:? aus  
and als much ahm peat from ahm sweden
- (5) ↓r:uslan:de:¿ aus deutschlan:de.  
from russia from germanny

- (6) \*h\*h au:s: eh\* 'hh\*olland und' >andere re↑gio:[nen?<]  
 from ahm holland and other regions
- (7) B: [m: ]  
 mmm

We need to bear in mind that the representative of the Italian company, A, is in the process of introducing his own firm. In line (4), he shows that it is relevant that his company deals in peat; with whom and exactly where is not relevant to him on the level of the interaction. In accordance with the above analyses of location and membership, the speaker mentions country names that belong to the category “Europe”. He shows clearly that he is searching for members of the subcategory “European countries” ((4) aus: eh ↑schwedene:? (6) h\*h\* au:s: eh\* 'hh\*olland) and he lists them. He constructs the list in such a way that the first-mentioned countries form a rhythmical unit: both the medium-stressed first syllables and the weakly stressed last syllables in the first three countries are spoken in measured time, as it were. This pattern is broken after “aus deutschlan:de”, when the country “‘hh\*olland”, which actually closes the sequence, is construed rhythmically as an appendix.

While the speaker mentions certain European countries that trade in peat, he also indicates that it is *not* first of all the *individual* country that is of importance, but rather the extension of the list of relevant countries. This is done by assigning equal stress to all the enumerated country names, the first three of which are rhythmically united, and also by the very act of listing. The end of the speaker's turn in line (6), “andere re↑gio:[nen?]” likewise contributes to this, as the speaker indicates with this phrase that the list of candidate countries is not exhaustive. In *doing being ‘international’*, the point is not to provide an exact number of countries (and this also applies to numbers such as “three” in a list of three country names), but to indicate that *several different* countries are relevant to the speaker.

The list of countries in lines (4)/(5), follows the “ahh\*a,” uttered by B in line (3). Speaker, A relates this “ahh\*a,” to the last element of his previous turn “>und ander:e ↑länder:<,” in which he already has indicated the international character of his firm. Based on this “ahh\*a,” speaker A shows that *more* information with respect to countries is relevant for the presentation of the company's services. Evidently, it is of importance for the conversational partner that the Italian company is engaged in the same activities or does business in *various* countries. In other words, we have the function of *doing being ‘international’*. The company's transnational operation testifies to its capacity, expressed via the company's activities. The set of “identifying features”, in contrast to those given for its business partners at home and abroad, are here of the type: “Try to recognize the firm” (which is also mentioned by name initially). As can be seen, in this case both conversational partners are materially involved in the organization of the phenomenon.

### 3.3. The construction of *doing ‘being international’* in its local sequential context

Naturally, *doing being ‘international’* is realized in different ways depending on the local sequential context. The following example (7a) shows how it can be construed in a completely different contextual environment. First of all, it should be pointed out that the speaker here does not construct a sequence within a “turn constructional unit” (TCU, Sacks et al., 1974) as in example (3) above, but exclusively organizes it transcending the TCUs. Moreover, the conversational partner does not (as was the case in example (3)) make a contribution to *doing being ‘international’*.

Ex. (7a) (A represents a German, B a Danish company)

- (1) B: eh wir habn eine gro:ße:: [dänische ] (0.2) f:irma:  
ahm we have a big danish (0.2) company a (0.4) pig (.)
- (2) A: [clears throat]
- (3) B: =eine: (0.4) s:chwein (.) s:ucht:irma:  
raising farm
- (4) (1.0)
- (5) B: [u:nd] eh U:nd eh w' w' s:ie wollen ja: natürl:cher=  
and ahm and ahm you naturally too do not want to
- (6) A: [di']  
the
- (7) B: =weise auch nicht diesen produkt v:erkaufn:, (0.4) we:nn sie (0.2)  
sell this product, (0.4) when you (0.2)
- (8) n:icht daran' sicher wa:r daß e[s:: ] >eine gude=  
were not sure that it is
- (9) A: [°eben°]  
right
- (10) B: =produkt ist.<  
a good product
- (11) A: j:a:  
yes
- (12) (0.6)
- (13) B: eh und au' eh u:nd auch ander business m:it eine: (0.3)  
ahm and als ahm and also other business with a (0.3)
- (14) w:ie s:ollen wir sagen eine (0.5) p:rivate verka:ufer  
how shall we say a (0.5) private dealer
- (15) (0.6) so habn wir in' (0.3) in in no:rwegen zum beispiel  
(0.6) thus we have in (0.3) in in norway for example
- (16) ein 'pri↑va:de ver↓ka:ufer er hat keine: (0.4) 'gro:ße  
a private dealer he does not have a big
- (17) firma,=er hat nicht zu selbständig verka:ufen di' mi: eh  
firm, he does not have the
- (18) mi: eh middel.  
me ahm mi ah means to trade independently
- (10 TCUs describing the activities of this dealer and the closure of the topic are omitted)
- (34) A: °ja:°  
yes
- (35) (0.5)
- (36) B: in in in: eh 'in' (0.5) ehm ö:sterreich (.) hh\*abn wir  
in in in ahm (0.5) austria (.) we hh\*ave a (0.4)
- (37) eine: (0.4) eine kunde eine eine (0.4) v:ertreder,  
customer a a (0.4) representative
- (38) (0.4)
- (39) A: j:a:  
yes
- (40) (0.6)

- (41) B: 'die mit eh yorhe:r m:it eine: >produkt die heißt<  
 who with ahm earlier have worked with a product that is
- (42) (0.3) seovita:l (.) gearbeidet habn.  
 called (0.3) seovital (.)

In each of the turns marked by an arrow, the speaker provides identifying features of the type: “Try *not* to recognize my business partner”. The partner is described in generic terms, thus in turns (1)/(3)/(5)/(7), for instance: “schwein(.)s:uchtfirma:;/s:ie wollen auch nicht v:erkaufn:”; in turns (16)/(17), for instance: “pri↑va:de ver↓kaufn/große firma”; in (37)/(42) “eine kunde/eine (0.4) v:ertreder/seovita:l (.) gearbeidet”. In each of these cases, the speaker mentions the countries, or the national identity of his partners respectively, namely “dänische/no:rwegen/ö:sterreich” (Danish, Norwegian, Austrian).

It is evidently important to the speaker to mention *several* countries; he shows this by listing countries and searching for them. In lines (15) and (36), his search manifests itself in the repetition of the preposition “in” before “no:rwegen” and “ö:sterreich”, respectively (line (15) in' (0.3) in in no:rwegen; line (36) in in in: eh 15 (0.5) ehm ö:sterreich). In line (15) he also adds “for instance”, by which he literally expresses the fact that “no:rwegen” is only one item of this category among others which could be listed at this point, that is, of countries in which partners that cannot be identified carry out the same activities for or with him.

While in this example the speaker lists countries (in contrast to the preceding examples), he distributes the sequence across several TCUs. After sets of two countries the speaker “identifies” the respective partners on the basis of both the latters' activities and anecdotal informations about them; he does not mention the name of a business partner in any of the TCUs. The sequences are constructed as follows:

- (1) country - category - anecdote  
 (2) country - category - anecdote  
 (3) country - category - anecdote

In this context it is not important with whom one does business, nor what each of the partners has said; however, it is important that the speaker has business partners in *several different* countries and from *different* nations. These business partners carry out (or represent) identical (or similar) activities. The speaker also indicates both on the syntactic and on the prosodic level that the many countries (that is the international character of his company) carry greater weight than the fact that he is dealing with several different business partners: whenever the speaker identifies his business partners, *he first mentions their national identity*, placing a medium degree of stress on the country.

Although his co-participant does not contribute to the phenomenon, A's responses affect its production. In line (12) there is a pause of 0.6s and in line (35) one of 0.5s. Before each pause, speaker A produces a minimal response to the information provided by B: in line (11) j:a; and in line (34) °ja:°. B takes the reactions and the subsequent pauses as indications of the fact that his conversational partner does not want to take over or continue the turn. Therefore B continues, but in doing so he does not produce a random continuation, but points out that the same activities (representation or sales) are also carried out in yet another country by yet another partner, who is likewise not expected to be recognized. Apparently, speaker B interprets his co-participant's minimal reactions as expressing a reluctance to do business with him. Therefore he upgrades his offer or makes a second offer (cf. Davidson, 1984, 1990) and mentions additional international business partners.



In this conversation speaker B links the capacity of his own company to international business. Incidentally, he does the same with his firm's *credibility*: Prior to these sequences (see Appendix B), his co-participant has complained about the information that speaker B had sent him. He told speaker B that he needed further information, as well as references and more trials. He then stated that he would only be willing to represent B's product on the German market after it had been fully tested, in order not to risk his credibility. Speaker B agreed to this and from line (1) (example 7a) of this extract, he indicates his consent by citing what other companies, persons, and business partners have said along the same lines, which is exactly the same as what has just been said by B. However, it must be pointed out, that these companies, persons, and business partners already represent his product and therefore (if for no other reason) support it. The trader and producer (B) indicates also, as has been shown above, that it is relevant to him that these are not just any companies, but companies from different countries. He mentions the name of the country at the beginning of the TCU and thus makes it the focus of attention when he lets his business partners' statements speak for the credibility of his product and his firm.

In example (7a) the co-participant orients towards this (cf. example (7b), below), even when he makes it clear that speaker B has not been successful in instilling confidence in his products by appealing to the “internationality” of his firm.

Ex. (7b) (A represents a German, B a Danish company)

- (1) A: wenn s:ie heute in dänema:rk meinetweng gude  
if you have had good experiences today let's say in  
(2) er:fahrungn gemacht haben oder in schwe:den? (0.2) \*h  
denmark or in sweden (0.2)  
(3) h\* ↑gut (0.5) das ↓glAU:bt i:hnen >der däne oder schwe:de:.<  
OK (0.5) that may be credible for your dane or your swede  
(4) (0.4)  
(5) B: j:a' ~~he~~  
yes he  
(6) (0.2)  
→ (7) A: we:nn sie in Deutschland irgendwas ↑machen ↓wollen,  
if you want to obtain anything at all in Germany,  
(8) (0.4) \*h dann we:rden sie wohl auch irgendwo: in  
(0.4) then quite likely somewhere in  
(9) deütschland ↓versuhh\*e mache müssen.  
Germany you will have to make efforts  
(10) (1.1)  
(11) A: ↑ähnlich (.)↓gelagerte versuhh\*e.  
similarly (.) situated efforts  
(12) (0.2)  
(13) B: ↑j:a ja: eh[: ]  
yes yes ahm  
(14) A: [sOnst GL]aubt der i:hnen das nicht und  
otherwise he doesn't believe you and  
→ (15) exakt dasselbe is wenn: sie nach ↑frankreich ↓gehn.  
exactly the same happens in france if you go there  
(16) (0.4)

- (17) B: dann glaubt ihnen des dr fr:an↑zo:se ↓nicht.  
 then the frenchman won't believe you
- (18) (0.2)
- (19) A: [\*h >woas die<] deutschen machen oder wäs=  
 what the Germans do or what
- (20) B: [eh:: ]  
 ahm
- (21) A: =die ↑tänen machen,  
 what the danes do

In this sequence, the conversational partners discuss whether (more) trial marketing should be carried out in Germany. In the stretch of conversation preceding this extract, speaker B states that he cannot run trials in every country of Europe; in other words, it should suffice for him to have run trials in *several different* countries. This is in line with the *doing being 'international'* that he has engaged in so far. His co-participant orients towards this in lines (1)–(21), where he touches upon the statements made by his business partner in extract (7a). While in extract (7a) speaker B does not speak of “good” experiences in Denmark and Sweden, speaker A treats them as such, implying that speaker B has referred to “good” experiences in Denmark and Sweden, something which must partly be ascribed to speaker B’s previous initiation of *doing being 'international'* (extract 7a). This initiation is made relevant and the co-participant’s understanding of it is displayed in and through their actions later in the interaction. First, speaker A doubts the “good” experiences in line ((1): “wenn”; “meinetweg”),<sup>9</sup> then he questions the credibility which the “internationality” of the Danish firm is supposed to guarantee. In referring to this “internationality”, in extract. (7b) he partly avails himself of the same means that speaker B had employed in his *doing being 'international'* in extract (7a). He names activities and different countries, but omits to indicate that several more could be mentioned — something which, strictly speaking, is not necessary either. He does not quote speaker B, but recapitulates what the latter can be assumed to have meant. However, in contrast to speaker B, he refers to this “internationality” in order to cast doubt on the very credibility it is supposed to guarantee. He limits the applicability of the trials made in the countries mentioned by A to the respective countries and their peoples: Danes trust trials carried out in Denmark, Swedes those carried out in Sweden, Germans those carried out in Germany, and the French only trust trials run in France. The fact that the speaker orients towards the function of the previous speaker’s *doing being 'international'* (here: establishing credibility) does not mean that he goes along with what the previous speaker wanted to achieve by his *doing being 'international'*.

The phenomenon of *doing being 'international'* can now be described as follows with respect to its function (a) and its construction (b), (c), and (d):

- (a) The speaker announces that the company he represents does business not just in a single, but in *several different* countries. This (speaker) action is understood by the co-participant as a technique which shows the capacity and/or the credibility of the (speaker’s) company.
- (b) He mentions countries in which “his” own firm and/or (business) partner(s) of his firm is/are doing business.

<sup>9</sup> “meinetweg” (*meinetwegen* (‘as far as I am concerned’)) indicates at the same time that speaker A’s utterance is not hypothetical, but that it takes speaker B’s utterance into account.

- (c) He sets up a list of “identifying features” for “his” firm of the type: *Try to recognize the company*. For the business partner(s), he lists features of the type: *Try not to recognize the (or any) company* or he does not make identification relevant at all.
- (d) He lists at least *two* countries in which *similar* activities are carried out, and indicates that *more* could be enumerated.

#### 4. Doing being ‘international’ in international communication

In the conversations analyzed above the participants make national geographic categories (the country of the firm they represent) relevant and design their “shared European geographies” for their recipients as: representatives of a specific firm which entails living in a certain country and being of a certain nationality. In the collaboratively constructed international context thus made locally relevant, the interlocutors orient towards the importance of being a member of the group of people representing international enterprises as they are *doing being ‘international’*.

#### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Dr. Martina Häcker for doing an intensive proof reading of the paper. Her input has been invaluable in helping to clarify the views presented in it. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their helpful and constructive comments to an earlier draft of this paper.

#### Appendix A

Transcript notations:

[first name]	Relevant contextual information.
[X]	Unrecoverable speech.
( )	Transcriptionist doubt.
(1)	Numbers in brackets indicate the number of lines in the transcription.
[	Left-hand brackets link an ongoing with an overlapping utterance at the point where overlap begins.
=	The equal sign links two adjacent utterances when there is no perceptible interval between them
O R	the equal sign links different parts of a single speakers continuous flow of speech that has been carried over to another line to accommodate an intervening interruption.
(0.1)	Inter- and mid-turn silences represented in tenths of a second.
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a pause less than 2/10 of a second
,	A comma indicates a rising intonation, weaker than?.
?	Rising intonation
↓	Falling intonation contour. Less than final.
.	Falling, or final, intonation contour.
he	Laughter.
( <del>ent</del> )	'smiley voice'.
*h	Audible inhalations.
h*	Audible exhalations

:	Colons represent lengthened vowels and consonants. The number of colons shows the relative stretch of sound.
<u>she</u>	Stress or emphasis. The more underlining, the greater the emphasis.
She	Loud talk. The louder, the more letters in upper case.
°	The talk following the degree sign was markedly quiet or soft.
↑	Sharp rise, a shift or resetting of the pitch register.
↓	Sharp fall, a shift or resetting of the pitch register.

## Appendix B

Ex. (6) (A represents a German, B a Danish company)

- (1) A: das hei:ßt (0.7) I:ch werde nu:r pr:odukte aufne:hmen, (1.2) die: wirklich  
that is to say (0.7) I will only carry products (1.2) that
- (2) hunder:tp:r:ozendi:g, (0.5) ↓was heißt hunder:tp:r:ozentig kann man nicht  
really one hundred percent (0.5) what hundred percent means one cannot
- (3) sa:genç =↑aber die neunzig oder oder achtzig pr:ozentig, \*h\*h zum:indest \*h  
say but the ninety or or eighty percent
- (4) (0.9) g:u::t (0.3) a:bgesichert sindç (0.3) \*h daß die au:ch ne gude wirkung  
at least (0.9) are well (0.3) secured (0.3) that they too have a good effect
- (5) habn.
- (7) (0.6)
- (8) A: \*h wenn du heude mit einem schlech:ten pr:odukt ↑zum bei:spiel ↓auf den  
when you today with a bad product for example|
- (9) markt ge:hst?  
enter the market
- (10) (0.3)
- (11) B: °j:a:°  
yes
- (12) (0.4)
- (13) A: \*h (.) dann (0.4) eh fliegst du: >audomati:sch::< (.) (14) auch mit deinen  
(.) then (0.4) ahm you land automatically (.) also with your
- (14) eignen pr:oduktn irgendwo: ins: >↓kommst du mit ins hinder:tr:effen.<  
own products somewhere in the you end up behind the game
- (15) B: °ja:: das das° 'kenn ich.  
yes that that I know about
- (16) A: DE:s is des pr:oblemç  
that is the problem
- (17) (0.4)
- (18) B: j[a: das ist ein:]°problem.°=  
yes that is a problem
- (19) A: [und deshalb]  
and therefore
- (20) A: =sag ich' n:u:r \*h (1.0) man: (0.2) \*wird so:was nur machen? (0.8) wenn die  
I just say (1.0) one (0.2) will do something like that only (0.8) when were
- (21) ↓ge↑schichte:, (0.5) \*wirklich woar (.) '↑einiAa:ßen, (0.7) >↓ich sag nicht  
to some degree (0.7) I'm not saying one

- (22) ↑hundertpr:ozent das kann man ni< n:ie:ma:ls sa:gen? (0.5) \*h abe:r 'neunzig  
hundred percent that one can ne never say really (0.5) but ninety
- (23) oder achtzigpr:ozentig einiAaßen ordentlich ↑abgesichert sind, (0.4) damit  
or eighty percent at least to some degree are secured (0.4) so
- (24) (.) de' dies <eigene pr:ogr:amm> oder die glaubwür:digkeit des verthat (.) the this own program or the credibility of the not representative
- (25) (0.7) \*h nicht (1.2) >'oder die glaubwür:digkeit der firma::< (0.5) ↓kh\*einen  
(0.7) (1.2) oder the company's credibility (0.5) does
- (26) na:chteil erhält.  
hot suffer prejudice
- (27) (1.0)
- (28) B: ° ja ja ri:chtig ja-: °  
yes yes right yes
- (29) A: ah?  
ah?
- (31) B: und das ist eh das ist kla::r u:nd eh (0.3) eh wi' wir' hh\*aben heutli diesel:be  
and that is ahm that is clear and ahm (0.3) w we have today the same
- (32) problema:tik hier in dä:nema:rk:  
problems here in Denmark
- (33) A: j:a:  
yes
- (34) B: eh wir habn eine gro:ße:: [dänische ] (0.2) firma:  
ahm we have a big danish (0.2) company a
- (35) A: [clears throat]
- (36) B: =eine: (0.4) schwein (.) s:uchtfirma:  
(0.4) pig (.) raising farm
- (37) (1.0)
- (38) B: [u:nd] eh U:nd eh w' w' s:ie wollen ja: natü:rlicher=  
and ahm and ahm you naturally too do not want to
- (39) A: [di']  
the
- (40) B: =weise auch nicht diesen produkt v:erkaufn:, (0.4) we:nn sie (0.2)  
sell this product, (0.4) when you (0.2)
- (41) n:icht daran' sicher wa:r daß e[s:: ] >eine gude=  
were not sure that it is a good
- (42) A: [°eben°]  
right
- (43) B: =produkt ist.<  
product
- (44) A: j:a:  
yes
- (45) (0.6)
- (46) B: eh und au' eh u:nd auch ander business m:it eine: (0.3)  
ahm and als ahm and also other business with a (0.3)
- (47) wie sollen wir sagen eine (0.5) p:rivade verkauffer  
how shall we say a (0.5) private dealer (0.6)

- (48) (0.6) so habn wir in' (0.3) in in no:rwegen zum beispiel  
thus we have in (0.3) in in norway for example
- (49) ein 'pri<sup>1</sup>va:de ver<sup>1</sup>kaufer er hat keine: (0.4) 'große  
a private dealer he does not have a big
- (50) firma,=er hat nicht zu selbständig ver<sup>1</sup>kaufen di' mi: eh  
firm, he does not have the me ahm mi.
- (51) mi: eh middel.  
ah means to trade independently
- (52) (0.3)
- (53) A: j[:a:-]
- (54) B: [u]nd Er kann immer (0.3) we:n das (0.6) (sen)syl:a:n pl' eh' plötzlich nicht  
and he can always (0.3) when the Sensylan sudd ahm suddenly does
- (55) funktionie:rt mehr=o:de:r oder (0.2) [oder] vie:le::: (0.3) eh eh w' eh wütene=  
not function any longer or or (0.2) or many (0.3) ahm ahm fu ahm furious
- (56) A: [j:a:- ]  
yes
- (57) B: =<sup>1</sup>leu:de (.) °(kligt) (.) eh ° >über die produkt<sub>1</sub>< (0.3) da können wir immer  
people (.) complains (.) ahm about the product (0.3) then we can always
- (58) sagen okay ich finde eine: andere pro<sup>1</sup>dukt<sub>th</sub>\*  
say okay I find another product
- (59) A: j:a:  
yes
- (60) (0.3)
- (61) B: a::ber >es ist eh de:shalb ist es eh< (0.2) mit 'gro:ße fi:rma so: wie sie: und eh  
but it is ahm therefore is it ahm (0.2) with big firm such as you and ahm
- (62) unser dänische: (0.4) ehm: k' kunde::und DANN müssen man vor(.).s:ichtig  
our Danish (0.4) ahm cu customer and then one has to be care(.)ful
- (63) sein und eh w'sie müssen auch sehr vorsicht [sein.]  
and ahm you too must be very careful
- (64) A: [°j:a:°]  
yes
- (65) (0.5)
- (66) B: in in in: eh 'in' (0.5) ehm ö:sterreich (.) hh\*abn wir  
in in in ahm (0.5) Austria (.) we have
- (67) eine: (0.4) eine kunde eine eine (0.4) v:er<sup>1</sup>treder,  
a (0.4) customer a a (0.4) representative
- (68) (0.4)
- (69) A: j:a:  
yes
- (70) (0.6)
- (71) B: 'die mit eh vorhe:r m:it eine: >pro<sup>1</sup>dukt die hei<sup>1</sup>t<  
who with ahm earlier have worked with a product
- (72) (0.3) seovita:l (.) gearbeitet habn.  
that is called (0.3) Seovital (.)
- (73) (0.2)
- (74) A: w:ie hei<sup>1</sup>t es?  
what is it called?

- (75) (0.3)
- (76) B: seo'v:ita:l (.) z (.) e o: (.) 'vita:l  
Seovital (.) z (.) e o (.) vital
- (77) A: z (0.3) e: (.) o:?  
z (0.3) e (.) o
- (78) (0.3)
- (79) B: vita:l  
vital
- (80) (0.3)
- (81) A: °z:eovita:l<sub>i</sub><sup>°</sup>  
zeovital
- (82) B: das ist eine: (.) 'un'ga:rische produkt<sub>i</sub>  
that is a Hungarian product
- (83) A: von nicht geh<sub>i</sub>ört=  
not heard of
- (84) B: =n:ein also ma' da' das is etwas für die: eh (.) 'nur' für die s:chweine, (0.2) \*h di'  
no so but that that is something for the ahm only for the pigs (0.2) the
- (85) sch die schweine im Fuddermittel (0.4) für die schwei:ne <und dann:  
the pigs in the fodder (0.4) for the pigs and then
- (86) bekommt eh w:ir' di:> die gülle me:hr flüssig und eh >und und und< (0.6) \*h or  
we gets th the manure more liquid and ahm and and (0.6) or
- (87) und ehm (0.2) 'aber da: soll mAns eh 'ph\*aledden liefern ↓zu je:de bauern=  
and ahm (0.2) but then one has to deliver it ahm brackets to every farmers
- (88) und: [↑das] hat=  
and that has
- (89) A: [j:a: ]  
yes
- (90) B: v:iele 'große'transportkosten sowas.=  
many big freight costs that kind of thing.
- (91) A: =°j:a:°  
yes
- (92) (0.4)
- (93) B: hh\*abn nicht so: gud °probiert° (0.5) und j<sub>i</sub>etzt hat er unser produkt eh  
have not tried so well (0.5) and now he has ahm started with our product
- (94) eingeführt u:nd eh >das hat me:r nat<sub>i</sub>rllicher auch< (0.6) n:at<sub>i</sub>rllicherweise auch  
and ahm that has he natural also (0.6) naturally also
- (95) nicht gemacht<sub>i</sub> (0.2) vorher=er wußte das funktionie:rt (0.6) ↓er hat selbst ein  
not done (0.2) earlier he knew it functions (0.6) he has himself a
- (96) kleine: eh: eh o°hof oder was eh°  
small ahm ahm o farm or what ahm
- (97) A: j:a: ja:  
yes yes
- (98) B: ↑und eh da: hat ers es v' v:ersucht und eh nach (0.5) z::wei drei: (0.4) eh  
and ahm then he has tried it (0.5) and ahm after (0.5) two three (0.4) ahm
- (99) wochen könnte er scho:n die underschied sehen<sub>i</sub>,  
weeks he could already see the difference
- (100) (0.5)

- (101) A: hm-:;  
hm
- (102) B: und eh e er' er' er' s' eh so' so wie er sagt zu seine: (.) kunden=<sup>↑</sup>ich gehe nicht  
and ahm he he he ahm so as he says to his (.) customers I go not to
- (103) <sup>↓</sup>zum eh meine kunden (0.3) we:h\*n ich (0.5) eh nicht hh\*undertprocent sicher  
ahm my customers (0.3) when I (0.5) not hundred percent sure
- (104) ist daß wi:r' g'ibt eh g:ude produkt (0.5) w' w' weil wehn es >eine schlechte  
is that we gives ahm good product (0.5) for when it is a bad
- (105) produkt ist,< (0.3) dann 'kenn ic' 'kann ich' (0.8) kö' eh kann ich eh in sukunft  
product (0.3) then I can I can (0.8) cou ahm can I ahm in future
- (106) °ja° n:icht' m:it eine <sup>↑</sup>dridde <sup>↓</sup>produkt kom:.  
of course not come with a third |product
- (107) (0.6)
- (108) B: da: kann ic' eh da habe ich keine chance me:hr. h\*he  
then I can ahm then I have no chance any longer he
- (109) A: hm:  
hm

## Ex. (7a)

- (1) B: und wi: eh jetzt machen wir auch' hier in dä:nemark  
and we ahm now we do also here in Denmark
- (2) eine (0.3) \*h versuch' mit eine: laboraTo:rium<sub>↓</sub>  
an (0.3) experiment with a laboratory,
- (3) (0.4)
- (4) A: °j:a:°  
yes
- (5) B: eh:m (0.2) >sie wollen gerne< se:hen (.) 'oob es (0.8)  
ahm (0.2) they would like to see (.) if it (0.8)
- (6) ehm: (0.7) o'eh oob es' gai gäse (.) findn (0.3)  
ahm the ahm (0.7) i ahm if it ga gases (.) find (0.3)
- (7) o:der (0.5) ub es wo:hl so: daß' eh eh die gäse wird  
or (0.5) if it maybe so that ahm gases
- (8) nicht produzie:rt,  
is not produced,
- (9) (.)
- (10) B: eh'  
ahm
- (11) (0.4)
- (12) A: j:a:=  
yes
- (13) B: =das <sup>↑</sup>wei<sup>↓</sup>sen wir nicht einglich.  
that we don't know really
- (14) (1.0)
- (15) B: eh wi:r' wir maggen jo mehr mehr eh theoretische:: oob  
ahm we we do make more more ahm theoretical ob
- (16) (.) servationen für' unser pro<sup>↓</sup>dukt also weil vorher  
(.)servations for our product well because earlier



- (17) hat man nicht so viel gewußt hat man nur gesehen ↑ja:  
one has not known so much one has only seen yes
- (18) ↓es wird homo↓ge:n ↑ja: ↓es[:h\*]  
it gets homo|genous yes it
- (19) A: [hm]:  
hm
- (20) (0.4)
- (21) B: eh' w:ird gr:o:b lidt weniger eh und:  
ahm becomes coarse a little less ahm and
- (22) (0.2)
- (23) A: °j:a:°  
yes
- (24) (0.3)
- (25) B: >'und so und so:¿<  
and so and so
- (26) (0.8)
- (27) B: ehm (0.4) >man mǎ m:an müs es< eignli'eh' eignli\*  
ahm (0.4) one should one should really ahm really
- (28) proBie:ren eh weil es ↑gibt ↓auch bauern die sagt (0.3)  
try it out ahm because there are also farmers who says (0.3)
- (29) ↑ja: ↓es funktioniert nicht. (.) >wir habn ja' n:icht<  
yes it doesn't function (.) but we haven't
- (30) ge↑sehn.  
seen
- (31) (0.7)
- (32) B: eh w d:as pas↑sie:rt auch ↓m'anchmal al[saa]:  
ahm w that happens often too it does
- (33) A: [hm-]  
hm
- (34) (0.6)
- (35) B: eh >und das is des< (.) das k'ann wir nicht genau  
ahm and that is that (.) that we cannot exactly
- (36) ↑schwie:rigs e:r'↓klä:ren alsaa,  
difficult to explain it is
- (37) A: °j:a: [j:a:°]  
yes yes
- (38) B: [wi]r HA:bn gesehen zum beispiel in schwe:den  
we have seen for example in Sweden
- (39) dort (0.4) \*h ↓wehn man m:it ↑CHlo:r (.)↓chlo  
there (0.4) when one with chlori (.) chlor
- (40) chlori:n:  
chlorine
- (41) (0.4)
- (42) B: arbeidn (0.2) [in ] sta:ll ↓sauber machen:¿ (0.6)=  
work (0.2) in pigsty clean up (0.6)=
- (43) A: [ne:]  
no

- (44) B: =↑dann: ' ?h'at es kei:n effekt.  
then it has no effect

## References

- Antaki, Charles, Widdicombe, Sue (Eds.), 1998. *Identities in Talk*. Sage, London.
- Baker, Carolyn, 1997. Membership categorization and interview accounts. In: Silverman, D. (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. Sage, London, pp. 130–143.
- Baker, Carolyn, 2000. Locating culture in action: membership categorisation in texts and talk. In: Lee, A., Poynton, C. (Eds.), *Culture and Text: Discourse and Methodology in Social Research and Cultural Studies*. Allen & Unwin, St. Leonards, NSW, pp. 99–113.
- Bergmann, Jörg R., 1994. Ethnomethodologische Konversationsanalyse. In: Fritz, G., Hundsnurscher, F. (Eds.), *Handbuch der Dialoganalyse*. Tübingen, Niemeyer, pp. 3–16.
- Coulter, Jeff, 1982. *Rethinking Cognitive Theory*. Macmillan, London.
- Davidson, Judy, 1984. Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In: Atkinson, J.M., Heritage, J. (Eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 102–128.
- Davidson, Judy, 1990. Modifications of invitations, offers and rejections. In: Psathas, G. (Ed.), *Interaction Competence*. International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis & University Press of America, Washington, D.C., pp. 149–179.
- Eglin, Peter, 2002. Member's gendering work: 'women', 'feminists' and membership categorization analysis. *Discourse & Society* 13, 819–825.
- Eglin, Peter, Hester, Stephen, 1992. Category, predicate and task: the pragmatics of practical action. *Semiotica* 88, 243–268.
- Eglin, Peter, Hester, Stephen, 1999. Moral order and the Montreal massacre: a story of membership categorization analysis. In: Jalbert, P.L. (Ed.), *Media Studies: Ethnomethodological Approaches*. University Press of America, Oxford, pp. 195–230.
- Goodwin, Charles, Heritage, John, 1990. Conversation Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19, 283–307.
- Have, Paul ten, 1999. *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. Sage Publications, London.
- Heritage, John, 1984. Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Heritage, John, 1987. Ethnomethodology. In: Giddens, A., Turner, J.H. (Eds.), *Social Theory Today*. Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 224–272.
- Hester, Stephen, Eglin, Peter (Eds.), 1997. *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*. University Press of America, Washington, D.C.
- Hester, Stephen, Housley, William (Eds.), 2002. *Language, Interaction and National Identity: Studies in the Social Organisation of National Identity in Talk-in-Interaction*. Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Housley, William, Fitzgerald, Richard, 2002. The reconsidered model of membership categorization analysis. *Qualitative Research* 2, 59–83.
- Hutchby, Ian, Wooffitt, Robert, 1998. *Conversation Analysis*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Jayyusi, Lena, 1984. Categorization and the Moral Order. Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston.
- Jefferson, Gail, 1990. List construction as a task and interactional resource. In: Psathas, G. (Ed.), *Interaction Competence*. University Press of America, Washington, D.C., pp. 63–92.
- McHoul, A., Watson, D.R., 1984. Two axes for the analysis of 'commonsense' and 'formal' geographical knowledge in classroom talk. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education* 5, 281–302.
- Nofsinger, Robert E., 1991. *Everyday Conversation*. Sage, London.
- Psathas, George, 1995. *Conversation Analysis. The Study of Talk-in-Interaction*. Qualitative Research Methods, vol. 35. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Rasmussen, Gitte, Wagner, Johs, 2002. Language choice in international telephone conversations. In: Luke, K.K., Pavlidou, Th.-S. (Eds.), *Telephone Calls*. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Sacks, Harvey, 1967. The search for help: no one to turn to. In: Shneidman, E.S. (Ed.), *Essays in Selfdestruction*. Science House, New York, pp. 203–223.
- Sacks, Harvey, [1971] 1992. Selecting identifications. Fall 1971. Lecture 5. In: Jefferson, Gail (Ed.), *Lectures on Conversation*, vol. II. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 444–452.
- Sacks, Harvey, [1972a] 1990. An initial investigation of the usability of conversational data for doing sociology. In: Coulter, Jeff (Ed.), *Ethnomethodological Sociology*. Elgar, Aldershot, pp. 208–253.

- Sacks, Harvey, 1972b. On the analyzability of stories by children. In: Gumperz, J.J., Hymes, D. (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. Rinehart & Winston, New York, pp. 325–345.
- Sacks, Harvey, 1979. Hotrodder: a revolutionary category. In: Psathas, G. (Ed.), *Everyday Language: Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Irvington, New York, pp. 7–14.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel, Schegloff, Gail, Jefferson, 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, 1972. Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In: Sudnow, David (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*. Free Press, New York, pp. 75–119.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, 1979. Identification and recognition in telephone conversation openings. In: Psathas, George (Ed.), *Everyday Language. Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Irvington, New York, pp. 23–78.
- Schegloff, Emanuel, 2007. A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39, 462–482.
- Steensig, Jakob, 2001. *Sprog i virkeligheden. Bidrag til en interaktionel lingvistik*. Aarhus Universitetsforlag Aarhus.
- Wooffitt, Robin, 1992. *Telling tales of the unexpected: the organization of the factual discourse*. Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.